

-17-

REMARKS

In response to the Final Office Action mailed on June 2, 2005 and Advisory Action Dated August 24, 2005, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration. Claim 34 has been added. Claims 1-4, 6, 8-17, 19, 21-27, 29, 31, 32 and 34 are now pending in this Application. Claims 1, 14, 27, 29, 31 and 34 are independent claims and the remaining claims are dependent claims. In this Amendment, claims 1, 8, 14, 21, 27, 29 and 31 have been amended, claim 33 has been cancelled and claim 34 has been added. A version of the claims containing markings to show the changes made is included hereinabove. Applicants believe that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance. A notice to this affect is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, 6, 8-17, 19, 21-27, 29-30 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,671,381 to Strasnick et al. (hereinafter Strasnick) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,006,227 to Freeman (hereinafter Freeman).

Strasnick, discloses at column 4, lines 11-21, a method and apparatus for displaying a three-dimensional navigable display space containing an aggregation of graphical objects and an overview of the aggregation of display objects. A data file appears as a data block within the information landscape. Freeman discloses at column 2., lines 15-20, a document stream operating system in which documents are stored in chronological streams. Neither Strasnick nor Freeman disclose rendering a document display wherein a document identifier indicates a correlation between a size of the document, an age of the document and a retrieval time required to obtain the document

In contrast to Strasnick and Freeman, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the document properties indicate a size of the document, an age of the document and a retrieval time to obtain the document. Support for this can be found throughout the specification, and in particular at page 13, lines 18-22, and further at page 17, line 18 through page 18, line 8. This allows the user to gain an understanding of how the ages, sizes and retrieval times of specific

-18-

documents relate to each other. Strasnick, as stated by the Examiner, does not teach a time associated with each object. The Examiner stated that Freeman teaches a document streaming operating system wherein each document is identified with a time indication. This time indication is relates to a time of creation of the document or the time that the document was sent to a person or entity, as recited at column 4, lines 6-30. Neither Strasnick nor Freeman, taken alone or in combination, disclose or suggest a retrieval time associated with a document. Accordingly, amended claim 1 is believed allowable over Strasnick and Freeman. Claims 14, 27, 29 and 31 have been amended in a similar fashion as claim 1 and are therefore believed allowable for the same reasons as claim 1. Claim 33 has been canceled. Claim 30 was canceled in the prior response. Claims 2-4, 6, 8-13, 15-17, 19, and 21-26 depend from claims 1 or 14 and are believed allowable as they depend from a base claim which is believed allowable. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1-4,6, 8-17, 19, 21-27, 29-30 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Strasnick in view of Freeman is believed to have been overcome.

The Examiner rejected claims 31 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Strasnick. Strasnick has been described above. Claim 31 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 33 and further to reflect that the retrieval time is one of the document properties. As discussed above, Strasnick does not disclose or suggest the use of a retrieval time as part of the document properties. Accordingly, the rejection of Claims 31 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Strasnick is believed to have been overcome.

The Examiner rejected claim 33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Strasnick in view of Freeman. Claim 33 has been cancelled. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 33 has been rendered moot.

Claim 34 has been added. Support for claim 34 can found throughout the specification as filed, for example at page 16, line 21 through page 17, line 17. Claim 34 recites in part that the time property associated with the document

-19-

represents a play time of an audio or video clip, the audio or video clip comprising the document. The prior art of record fails to disclose or suggest wherein the document includes a time property representing a play time of the document when the document is an audio or video clip.

In view of the above, the Examiner's rejections are believed to have been overcome, placing claims 1-4, 6, 8-17, 19, 21-27, 29, 31, 32 and 34 in condition for allowance and reconsideration and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

If the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office deems a fee necessary, this fee may be charged to the account of the undersigned, Deposit Account No. 50-0901.

If the enclosed papers or fees are considered incomplete, the Patent Office is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned collect at (508) 366-9600, in Westborough, Massachusetts.

Respectfully submitted,



David W. Rouille, Esq.
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No.: 40,150
CHAPIN & HUANG, L.L.C.
Westborough Office Park
1700 West Park Drive
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581
Telephone: (508) 366-9600
Facsimile: (508) 616-9805
Customer No.: 022468

Attorney Docket No.: SUN01-02

Dated: September 2, 2005